THEOLOGY

VOL. LV NOVEMBER, 1952 No. 389

Editorial Notes

IT would be a pity if the interest in the policies and responsibilities of the U.S.A. that the presidential election has occasioned were to evaporate as soon as the contest between the two candidates is concluded. The candidates this year have been, in their different ways, men of unusual distinction, a circumstance which has made the election a more fascinating spectacle to outsiders than might otherwise have been the case. But the interest displayed abroad has no doubt been prompted also by an appreciation of the fateful responsibilities of the American nation and of its rulers in the present phase of the world's history. Fortunately, it is a nation that has its own prophets in the authentic tradition of the Bible. Such is Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr, whose latest book, *The Irony of American History*,[1] penetrates far beneath the surface of contemporary politics; it will disturb all the complacencies, but will fortify humble men to bear the burden of power without being corrupted by it. "The question for a nation," he says, "particularly for a very powerful nation, is whether the necessary exercise of its virtue in meeting ruthlessness and the impressive nature of its power will blind it to the ambiguity of all human virtues and competencies; or whether even a nation might have some residual awareness of the larger meanings of the drama of human existence beyond and above the immediate urgencies" (p. 169).

* * * * *

Mother Julian's *Revelations of Divine Love* and *The Cloud of Unknowing* are English medieval mystical writings which ought always to be in print, so that they may constantly be winning new readers. Their appearance among "The Orchard Books"[2] is therefore welcome. They have not merely been reprinted, but have been carefully edited for inclusion in this series, and *The Cloud of Unknowing* is acompanied by Father Augustine Baker's commentary.

* * * * *

We are also happy to report a new edition of Dr G. L. Prestige's *God in Patristic Thought* (S.P.C.K., 21s.). The first edition, which was published by Messrs Heinemann, was reviewed in THEOLOGY, January 1937, pp. 53 f., by the late Dr F. J. Badcock.

---

[1] Charles Scribner's Sons, $2.50.

[2] *Revelations of Divine Love*, by Julian of Norwich. Edited and introduced by Roger Hudleston, O.S.B., Burns Oates, 15s. *The Cloud of Unknowing and other treatises by a 14th century English Mystic*. Revised, edited and introduced by Justin McCanny, O.S.B., Burns Oates, 16s.

Lund, 1952: The Present and Future of Faith and Order

THE Third World Conference on Faith and Order, held at Lund this August, marked no spectacular step forward in church relations, as did in different ways the First World Conference on Faith and Order at Lausanne in 1927, or the First Assembly of the World Council of Churches at Amsterdam in 1948. The significance of these latter events lay chiefly in the fact that they happened at all, and would have remained whatever the value of the theological work done at them had been. But Lund was not the first but the third in a series. Now that the Faith and Order Movement and the World Council of Churches are established realities, ecumenical conferences can no longer make news merely by happening. Lund must be assessed on its achievements, on whether it demonstrated any advance by the churches towards the point when they can confess the faith in common and live together in a common church order. A conference that marks neither the beginning nor the end of the road to unity cannot in the nature of the case be expected to produce a report that would hit the headlines in the daily newspapers. It seems that many of the delegates and observers who came to Lund had expected some great step forward, some announcement that important barriers between the churches had fallen, and were disappointed with the actual reports when they appeared. Certainly the reports of the sections might have been better than they were: they bear only too plainly the traces of the method by which they were composed. The conference report in which they were incorporated still shows the scars inflicted by the plenary sessions on most of the section reports, in spite of overnight first aid in the drafting committees. It is perhaps inevitable that the theological quality of the report as a whole should not be high, memorable as some sections are. In some respects it may appear to have registered less progress than the reports of previous ecumenical conferences. There is nothing here comparable with the resounding, even if conceivably illusory, agreements of Edinburgh on the doctrine of grace, or with the tight dialectic of Amsterdam and its firm delineation of the "catholic"-"protestant" difference. The Christological work recorded in Chapter II of the Lund report may in the end prove to have been more important than either of these, but with this exception the report on the whole does not make exciting reading. Yet could anything else have fairly been expected?

The Lund report is on the whole the work of the churches as they are, and not of a few ecumenical specialists. The specialists were there, and their influence is especially to be seen in Chapter II of the report, which opens with a common confession of faith about Christ and his Church, formulated in the language of Biblical theology. This is certainly one of the most important statements that the churches have ever made together. It shows clearly that a growing number of theologians have now learned to converse with one

another, and having passed through the stages of learning to understand one another's theological language and to state one another's convictions with fairness and accuracy, are now in a position to do theological work together in a common Biblical language. This part of the report, unlike most of the rest of it, contains few or none of those phrases by which form criticism could at once recognize any modern ecumenical document, the "we-agree-that's", "we-disagree-on's", "some-say's" and "others-would-hold's" that make so many of these documents dull and lacking in cutting edge. It is, on the contrary, a straightforward, concise and powerful statement of what our common acceptance of the Scriptures commits us all to believe and confess about the relation of the Church to Jesus Christ, her Lord and Head. Given the chance, the ecumenical theologians could no doubt have produced a whole report on these lines, and such a report would no doubt have made news. But even if the rest of the conference had been willing to give the inner ring of experienced ecumenical theologians their head, would it have been right to issue such a report as they might have written? Such a report would not have justly represented the convictions as they are at present of the churches that sent delegates to Lund, whatever some of us might wish were the case. The delegates to Lund were not all ecumenical specialists: some of them were outright novices in ecumenical work, and they apparently included an appreciable number who had not thought it their duty to make a preliminary study of the various Reports and Volumes produced by the three theological commissions in preparation for the work of the Conference. This disconcerting fact simply shows that the ecumenical movement has not yet fully penetrated the churches. It is plain that until the churches are more solidly committed to the ecumenical movement they will not feel confident that a delegation composed only of specialists in ecumenical questions will represent them to other churches as they really are. The novices also are needed, if the present convictions of the churches are to be realistically recorded.

Since the formation of the World Council of Churches the Faith and Order Movement has become part of the official relationships of the churches to each other and is no longer the special province of the most theologically minded of the devoted ecumenists. It may well be that the conception of a world conference on faith and order needs to be adjusted to conform with the change in composition of such conferences. A world conference is probably no longer the right place from which to expect creative theological work, and it should probably now be regarded much more as a barometer of the state of ecumenical conviction in the churches as a whole. Thus the decision taken at Lund to reduce the size of the Faith and Order Commission, and to relieve it of the responsibility of organizing world conferences at regular intervals, was a wise one. The new pattern will provide a means of calling together small groups of experts, by whom the creative work will be done, as it always must be. On the other hand, it will still be possible to call together large-scale conferences of the type of Lund, though no doubt at relatively infre-

quent intervals, when it seems that the reactions of the churches need to be tested. Against the background of centuries of disunity the achievements of the ecumenical movement in its short history have been remarkable, but it is probable that from now on progress will be much slower, and correspondingly more trying to the patience of those who have understood the urgency of Christ's call to unity.

Any sober assessment of Lund must start from these superficially disappointing but in reality encouraging facts—encouraging because they suggest that the churches are beginning to regard the ecumenical movement as part of their normal responsibilities. Against this background some things that happened at Lund stand out significantly. Certain theological tendencies, revealed in the contributions of certain groups, suggest a changing and perhaps promising situation. There are signs that the ecumenical movement will continue to develop along genuinely theological lines. That means that it may escape the dangers of holding conversations which are either detached technical arguments or the construction of compromising formulas by men in a hurry to achieve some sort of union at any theological cost. A genuinely theological ecumenical conversation would be one in which men wrestle as profoundly as possible with the mysteries of our common redemption, in order that together we may both offer a purer worship to our Lord and more faithfully and unambiguously confess him in the terrible world in which we live. If the work of Faith and Order should develop in this way, it will find itself increasingly driven out towards that double frontier where it is the Church's true nature and calling to exist. For true theological work can be done only by men who will face God defenceless, to bear his judgment and receive his mercy, and face the claim of the neighbour whose alienation from God demands an audible witness to that judgment and mercy. The theological task of Faith and Order is then nothing else than to help one another to move out from the securities of our own traditions to the frontier of our Christian existence, and there to discover together, not apart from these traditions but through them all, as they are searched out and known on the frontier, what the Church of Jesus Christ is and what is the redemption by which she lives. We find the same search for obedience in our theology reflected in the increasing confessionalism as well as increasing ecumenism which is to be observed as the conversation between the churches develops. It could not be claimed that Lund as a whole was theological in this sense, but it was helped towards that goal by three groups of persons in particular, groups which were not separate but overlapping.

The first of these groups consisted of the delegations sent by the churches from behind the so-called Iron Curtain. These churches have different experiences of communism, and their theological and political reactions to it differ correspondingly. Those who came from East Germany would and did say very different things from the delegates from Czechoslovakia and Hungary, of whom Professor Josef Hromádka of Prague was the spokesman. The latter have taken the intrepid step of saying yes as well as no to the revolution which has

been going on in their countries. Their presence at Lund could not be taken for granted. The fact that they came at all means that these men have not yet written off the Christians in the West, compromised as they must often seem to them to be, while the utterances of Hromádka and others at Lund will help to ensure that we in the West for our part do not dare to write off our brethren in the communist world. For however great may be the temptation, in a world so deeply divided, to deny that we are members of one another, the whole ecumenical concern, not to say our whole Christian existence, is bound up with our continued refusal to disown one another, for such a disowning of members of the Body of Christ from whom we are politically divided must mean in the end a denial of the Head of the Body. The mere presence of these men at Lund, even if they had never said a word, made the conference more theological by reminding it of the situation in which it was meeting, of a world in which it is more than ever important to confess and live out the oneness of mankind in the Body of Christ. Hromádka's major utterance came in a session on non-theological factors: he spoke of the necessity for us all of searching self-scrutiny in relation to these political, social and cultural factors, for it is just here in the world that the Church's obedience to God has to be offered; the Church must learn to judge every situation in the sovereignty of faith. The ecumenical importance of these and other delegates from behind the Iron Curtain is surely that their presence forces us to carry on our theological work in fellowship with men who may have to die for their faith at any moment. We can know the terms of reunion, or what elements in our own tradition must be upheld before other churches until they assent to them, and where we must accept criticism and correction from other churches, only when we are seeking to discover what if necessary we ought to die for, for we can unite or divide the Church only on matters of life and death.

A second group whose contribution reminded Lund of its calling to engage in genuine theological work came from the Younger Churches. Obviously not every speaker from the Younger Churches revealed deep concern for theological questions or an educated understanding of the issues that have divided the Older Churches. Even the most theologically sophisticated of the Younger Churchmen sometimes seemed to their European colleagues to be approaching union in a pragmatic rather than a theological fashion. But by their concentration on the world mission of the Church, and even sometimes by voicing the simpler convictions of Christ's little ones who will never be theologians, these delegates called Lund out of academic isolation to the place where real theology is possible.

The third group is more difficult to characterize. Some of its members were theological professors, others were professionally engaged in ecumenical work, and most (though not all) of its members were continentals. It was united by a sense of the pressure of the eschatological throughout theology and in particular on our understanding of the Church and its unity. The convictions of this group were voiced especially by Professor Edmund Schlink of

Heidelberg in a prophetic address on the Pilgrim People of God delivered early in the conference. A not dissimilar note could be detected in the addresses of Dr Visser 't Hooft and Mr Oliver Tomkins, of the World Council secretariat. Against the background of the final advent and judgment of Christ, in whose shadow the Church, and therefore the churches, stands permanently, our divisions assume a different kind of importance from that which we are accustomed to assign to them. Existing unities and disunities are alike seen to be provisional, to lack final validity, while the question which Christ will then ask echoes in our ears now as a call to obedience before it is too late: "Why did you not live together in the unity that I gave you?" Similarly, reflection on the relation between the eschatological and historical aspects of the Church's unity seems to bring us closer than any comparative ecclesiology, however long its list of agreements and disagreements may grow. This group was at least sure that that way—the way the Faith and Order Movement has been going up to now—can lead only to impasse after impasse.

The future of Faith and Order is hopeful if these three contributions can be brought together and permeate the whole work. For that reason, the closer integration which Lund planned of the work of Faith and Order with the whole study program of the World Council must be welcomed, in spite of some opposition from respected figures whose ideas of ecumenical work are bound up with the older pattern. It can only make Faith and Order more and not less theological if its work is now to be done in closer touch with the study of evangelism in the modern world, and of the Bible and its message, and with the concern of the Church for world order and responsible society. These are in fact the themes of the study section of the World Council. Nor can these other study projects fail to benefit from the direct concern for true doctrine which Faith and Order embodies. On that level, Lund made it clear that the Faith and Order inquiry must be moving towards the central mysteries of the faith. It began with various aspects of the Church's life. In the thirties, the ministry was the great preoccupation. The forties led on to the study of the Church itself. Now the fifties are revealing that we cannot resolve our differences about the Church unless we go deeper still, and plunge into Christology. The future of Faith and Order, so far as it can be seen at present, lies in corporate theological meditation upon the mysteries of Christ and the Holy Spirit, carried out, of necessity, in a context of worship and the study of worship, and of evangelism and the study of evangelism. Such a meditation will also necessarily involve, as we search our minds and consciences in the presence of God, an unremitting struggle to bring to light, at whatever cost to our pride, all those social, cultural and psychological factors which in setting up barriers to men now outside the Church also divide us from one another.

WILLIAM NICHOLLS.

Christian Optimism: Scott Holland and Contemporary Needs—I

In a proper study of the influence of Thomas Hill Green on English life, a space would have to be found for the deep inspiration which undoubtedly he provided for Henry Scott Holland. In Stephen Paget's Life of Holland[1] the examples of their correspondence given to the reader show that the Balliol philosopher was much more to the young ordinand and priest than teacher and tutor: he was in a strange, perhaps unique, sense spiritual director as well.

If a reader of Holland's sermons to-day begins with the opening sermons in *Logic and Life* (1882), he may well judge Green's influence dominant: but he will be wrong. By Green Holland had been exposed to the full impact of a particular stream of the humanistic culture of his age. The integrity of the man, the subtlety of his idealist "metaphysic of experience", the passion of his social concern—all these deeply affected the young student: his days at Balliol marked him for life. But if Green had taught him to look always for spiritual continuity, the New Testament spoke to him of life out of death, of gulfs crossed not by the development of an immanent spiritual principle but by the act of God.

Holland gave his theological work to the world largely in the form of sermons: he apologized for publishing them, but he argued that he had decided that he must be a preacher, and that therefore what he might more easily have done in his study he was compelled to do from the pulpit. His "torrential eloquence" is often mentioned: so too his consuming passion for social righteousness. But it is less often realized that he was a considerable theologian. He was very emphatically not one of those who appeal to an abstractly conceived theory of incarnation to justify some previously formed attitude to social evils. His sermons continually bear witness to the restless search and sweep of his theological thinking. Of course, it does not have the formal order rightly demanded of the academic theologian: but it does not neglect the duty of completeness. I mean Holland was never a man to hammer one aspect of the Christian verity to the omission of others: he had a profound intuitive sense of the unity of the faith committed to him. It was not that he ranged wide in choice of subject (he certainly did that), but that in lapidary sentences he would suddenly bring together a whole range of topics showing the tightness of the unity in which they were held.

For instance, this in a sermon on "The Mind of the Church" in *Creed and Character* (1887)[2]:

> Let us consider this (the compassion of the Father) in its depth, and width, and height. It is the compassion of the entire Godhead that builds the Church—the compassion of God, the great Father, made known to us through the tenderness and tears of a human heart, in flesh and blood, in Jesus Christ, his Son, our Brother. That compassion, as it is in Christ Jesus, offers itself in a shape that enthrals and subdues with a touch of human kinship; but nevertheless, it is, still, in him but a revelation of that supreme

[1] John Murray, 1921.

[2] Op. cit., pp. 113 f.

> compassion which moves the Father to send his Son into the world. The compassionate mercy of the Father sends his Son; and it is made manifest and sealed to us in that hidden, yet felt Spirit, whose very Name is given him for his pity, the Advocate, the Spirit of Consolation, the Comforter.
>
> The Ministry of the Church, then, arises out of the deep compassion of the Triune Godhead.

Holland is talking about the foundation of the Church. Therefore he must talk about the Father who sent the Son. Yet he must not neglect the particularity of Christ's incarnate life: nor the abiding ministry of the Paraclete, who takes the things of Christ and shows them to us. The whole paragraph reveals a deep theological self-discipline.

Again, in the sermons on sacrifice in *Logic and Life* you find the same impatient, yet disciplined, anxiety to leave nothing out. Of course, again they are sermons, not a treatise on redemption; but Holland sees that here pre-eminently the preacher must show a width of sympathy that acknowledges no other command to emphasis or integration than what is enjoined by the rich complexity of the New Testament. For instance, he is utterly emphatic that here we have at the very centre an act of God, unique, unrepeatable, costly: there is nowhere in Holland the slightest deviation from the central evangelical assertion. Yet this act of the Cross somehow at once illuminates the abysses of the divine love and the age-long problem of innocent suffering. Holland will never say that the Crucifixion is *merely* God's way of dealing with human guilt: it is that, but unfathomably more. So in the sermons on sacrifice he ranges passionately, restlessly, invoking now one scheme of images, now another: but always eschewing the deadly, sterile *merely*, conscious that here he is dealing with the ultimate mystery of the divine will, made accessible ("pity" is a word never long off his lips, for his thoughts will never stay long away from the ministry of the Galilean plains), yet inaccessible still; as concrete as the nails that fastened Jesus to his Cross (those nails and not others did the job), yet as universal as only the will of God can be.

Again in *Creed and Character* he turns to the theme of the Atonement. Here at once his language recalls that of John McLeod Campbell and anticipates that of R. C. Moberly.[1] But it has its own peculiar force:

> God's forgiveness issues out of Heaven in the shape of Man, bearing human flesh. Jesus Christ is the Forgiveness of the Father. The Father had already forgiven the world, when he sent his Son to be born of the Virgin Mary, to be crucified under Pontius Pilate. He arrives, bringing with him the pardon of the Father; and this pardon is effectual. For there is now in man one spot, at least, clean from defilement, on which the eyes of God's purity can afford to rest. There is now, amid the loveless hordes of sinners, one Heart, at any rate, upon which the Father can risk the outpouring of his love; one Body, amid the hopeless and the faithless and the diseased, which can admit the rushing power of the transfiguring Spirit. The love, hope, purity of God—long homeless and unhoused—have found at last a footing within our flesh, a resting-place, a habitation, a temple. They had looked, and there had been in man—not one that doeth good, no, not one!

[1] The first edition of *Atonement and Personality* was not published till 1901. I must thank the Bishop of Durham for pointing this out to me.

—not one that could respond to that appeal—not one that could surrender himself to their intimacy—no, not one; and, therefore, not one whom God could forgive. But now there is the Son of Man in and through whom God's forgiveness can begin to work. Christ, the Forgiveness, becomes the one forgiven Man: the one Son, who has sanctified himself to do the Father's will.[1]

The language is extremely bold: but it comes in the third and last of a group of three sermons on the Law of Forgiveness, and shows how surely Holland grasped in practice the principle that Christian thought must accept the discipline of Christology. If we plot the rules governing the use of a fundamental noun like forgiveness, and a still more fundamental verb like forgive, we must see that their very claim to be fundamental stands only when their use about and in relation to Christ is made plain. Something of what Holland is after here has been more recently canvassed by Dr C. H. Dodd in his arresting use of the idea of manhood's *transparency* to God in Christ.[2] In Dodd[3] as well as in Holland the treatment of Christ's manhood is seen to involve not merely the issue of its relation to that divine nature to which it is united: at the same time, the theologian must fasten on the relation in which both that human nature and that divine alike (for it is the Son who is incarnate) stand to the Father. Holland's boldness of language is an expression of his relentless recognition of this crux. Now, it may seem strange at first that sensibility to a major theological crux makes a man bold. Yet the boldness that issues from a slapdash over-simplification of the complexity of the Gospel is not of course real theological courage; it is the brash bravado of the spiritual Philistine and only serves to strengthen the prejudices of a falsely scholastic orthodoxy. Holland's boldness is that of the man who sees that it is at the points of greatest difficulty that the most precious insights lie, and that bold, almost extravagant language is warranted at once to advertise and safeguard such treasure. To speak of Christ as the Forgiven Man is startling, especially if at the same time he is called the Forgiveness of the Father. But if it is startling, it is also crystalline clear, although the clarity is that of the deepest waters, not of the muddy shallows.

Earlier in this group of sermons Holland had spoken most poignantly of the mystery of Christ within us:

> And what, if around and about this poor, this impoverished will, there were wrapped the irresistible might of a will that had not been broken, a will, new, fresh, undaunted, tough as steel, endurable as stone, firm as adamant?—What if the warmth of a love were about it to which the emotions of impure appetites are impossible?—What if we were given up to this love, so that it abode within us and possessed us and held us fast, untroubled by our disaster, unhurt by our sins?—What if, after all our sinning, we still could turn back again and again to find this loving will there still, pure and strong, as ever within us, still pressing with unwearied patience, on towards the beauty of holiness, with its unwavering eyes ever fixed on the face of God.[4]

[1] Op. cit., pp. 224 f.; cf. Karl Barth's view of Jesus as der Erwählte.
[2] Cf. his *Benefits of his Passion:* 1947, Lutterworth Press.
[3] Although to a lesser extent. Perhaps we shall have a sustained treatment in *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel.*
[4] Op. cit., p. 217.

The language is severely ethical. Holland displays an extreme sensitivity to the reality of human guilt and the irreversibility of human choice. As a good Anglican he sees in the doctrine of "justification by faith"[1] an assertion of "our absolute exclusion from the creative act by which God acquits us; in that act we have no more part or lot than in the act of our first begetting". Yet our healing is in Christ Incarnate: and Holland sees that if we most certainly must remember the Cross on Christmas Day, we must not forget the "honour God did to man in the Incarnation" (a form of words he often uses) on Good Friday; nor on either day forget the Resurrection and Pentecost. There is a wholeness in the faith that is wholly reconcilable with the sharp discontinuities one discovers within it. That wholeness commands us to mark well the otherness of Christ and his strangeness: but it is the otherness of one who is Man, who makes the healing of our human state possible in, not apart from, manhood. Thus as man, now risen and ascended, he is within the very body of our lives, their sweet, sound heart and centre. "Love would not be moral if it were not vicarious."[2] And that for Holland is true pre-eminently of that love which is the source of all love, the love of God whose definitive expression is the mystery of Christ.

Holland's treatment of redemption is the very core of his preaching and work, and it has a remarkable completeness of view. His emphasis on forgiveness of sin shows that he accepted as partly valid juridical categories: but if, like so many Anglicans, he seems nearer to McLeod Campbell than to Dale or to Denney, it is because he discerns in the Cross an outpouring of divine love in humanity that just cannot be contained by any quasi-juridical scheme. He is always moving behind such a network of conceptions as if somehow he would show them less than quite ultimate. But his theology remains for that obstinately a *theologia crucis*: one may even say that it is most obstinately so just when this mood is on him. For there he is intoxicated by the sense of Christ as the "revelation of the mystery", as himself concretely the key to all the riddles of existence. It is his passionate Christocentrism that somehow is on edge in the presence of all that seems in any way to diminish the depth of Christ's penetration of the stuff of our humanity.

This comes out clearly at points where one might expect the influence of Green to be strongest—in a group of sermons in *On Behalf of Belief* (1889) where he deals with human history. They reach their climax in a sermon on the Circumcision which is, in my judgment, one of his very greatest. In the whole group he is concerned with the obstinacy of human things, the backlash of stupidity and evil that will not be subdued to purposes of God. He shows a certain kinship with, as well as a real difference from, F. J. A. Hort in his exposition of the way theological progress has been achieved. When he sketches the wide canvasses of historical progress, Holland the preacher shows a sharper, clearer sense of the realities than fashionable contemporary theologians like Niebuhr sometimes

[1] Op. cit., pp. 221 f. [2] Op. cit. p. 218

command. For he does take with an utter, an almost desperate seriousness that "God is like Christ". In earlier years he had preached on "Christ, the justification of a suffering world": but now quite simply, with a curious freedom from any air of triumphantly demonstrating a truth, he points to the suffering Christ, the revelation of the Father, as the only key we have to the inner ways of God, and the only sure guide to the posture befitting us in the world he has fashioned.

The sermon on the Circumcision is the climax of this group. Its ethical gravity recalls the minute, devastating argument of Butler's Dissertation, or his sermon on self-deceit. But it is more than an eloquent uncovering of the sin of the man who makes his own purposes the measure of being, who dreams of a *tabula rasa*, and dares himself to clean the slate. We are enabled to see the falsity of such an attitude as pointing beyond itself to the Incarnation.

> As we glance down that long list of our Lord's forefathers in St Matthew or in St Luke—which looks so stiff and legal, and monotonous—how pathetic, how profound the significance becomes, as we remember what that list embodies! There, in those dry names, lies the record of the burden which the centuries had slowly built together for the Lord to carry. Through that line of names the story of man's life reached him. It arrived to him charged with all that those men had made it—their struggles, their hopes, their joys, their woes, their sins, their pains. Out of the nameless years which had come and gone, a certain sequence had preserved itself through those remembered men, links in the long chain from Abraham and David. A tradition had handed itself down, a story had been prolonged, a memory had survived and grown, and accumulated details, and gathered in continuous experiences. Passions, aspirations, miseries, losses—all had stored their results within this unbroken and enduring movement. Such strange exaltations, such untoward reverses, such patient persistence, such stubborn obscurity, had all gone to the fashioning of that family of David! Into it had passed much that was worthiest and much that was worst of human character and incident. Ruth, and David, and Zerubbabel, pastoral loyalty, royal glories, heroic deliverances—yes, but also, as St Matthew seems to suggest with frequent emphasis, Tamar, with her terrible scandal; Rahab harlot of Jericho; and Bathsheba, the wife of David's sin. And all this inheritance, just as it stood, at the particular moment when Caesar first prepared to lay the bitterest mark of servitude upon the race which once had tasted the free royalty of David—all this, without turning one jot or tittle of it aside, without shrinking, without refusal, our Lord assumed for his own on the day when he was carried to the Temple as the Child of Mary.[1]

Holland is not talking about the Old Testament types for their own sake: he is speaking of Jesus as fulfilling God's work as himself

[1] On *Behalf of Belief*, pp. 193 ff. Holland's understanding of history is echoed in a remarkable way by Hans Urs von Balthasar in his recent essay, *Theologie der Geschichte* (Christ Heute: 1. Folge, 8. Heft—Einsiedeln, 1950). Like Holland, von Balthasar finds the key to the doctrine of providence in Christology, and that Christology of a strongly kenotic emphasis. He starts from a profound discussion of Christ's attitude towards that hour which lay in his Father's hand, of the utter reality for him of time, and moves on through a massive argument to the conclusion that the innermost sense of history lies for the Christian less in the conflict of the "two cities" than in the struggle of the Bridegroom with the Bride. If he goes beyond Holland, he agrees with him in a radical Christocentricism (learnt perhaps partly from his effort to come to terms with Karl Barth) and in emphasis on the patience of God. I am most grateful to Prof. T. F. Torrance for calling my attention to his work.

the very Will of God. He is pointing to his self-identification with the particularities of Israel's history as the ultimate sanction of an obligation to an analogous acceptance of the conditions in which we in our day and generation must act. We must avoid false archaism as well as utopian scheming: no fight is the "last fight" (save only *Christi gloriosi proelium certaminis*), nor does any age, Carolingian or Caroline, Innocentian or Elizabethan, qualify to tempt us to waste our days in dreaming nostalgically its faded glories. We are where we are, even as Christ was where he was.

D. M. MacKinnon.

(*To be concluded.*)

Dodwell and the Doctrine of Apostolic Succession

Henry Dodwell was born in 1641, and died in 1711. "That great Lay Dictator, Mr. D., took offence", writes the anonymous contemporary biographer of Robert Frampton, the Non-juring Bishop of Gloucester.[1] Burnet, in the *History of his own times*, gives a fuller description:[2]

> He was a very learned Man, and led a strict Life; he seemed to hunt after Paradoxes in all his Writings; and broached not a few; he thought none could be saved, but those who, by the Sacraments, had a federal right to it; and that these were the Seals of the Covenant: So that he left all, who died without the Sacraments, to the uncovenanted Mercies of God: and to this he added, that none had a Right to give the Sacraments, but those who were commissioned to it; and these were the Apostles, and after them Bishops and Priests ordained by them: It followed upon this, that Sacraments administered by others were of no Value. He pursued these notions so far, that he asserted that the Souls of Men were naturally mortal, but that the immortalizing Virtue was conveyed by Baptism, given by Persons Episcopally ordained. And yet, after all this, which carried the Episcopal function so high, he did not lay the Original of that Government, on any Instruction or Warrant in the Scripture: But thought it was set up, in the beginning of the second Century, after the Apostles were all dead. He wrote very doubtfully of the Time, in which the Canon of the New Testament was settled; he thought it was not before the second Century, and that an extraordinary Inspiration was continued in the Churches to that very Time, to which he ascribed the Original of Episcopacy. This strange and precarious System was in great credit among us; and the necessity of the Sacrament, and the Invalidity of ecclesiastical Functions, when performed by Persons, who were not Episcopally ordained, were entertained by many with great Applause: This made the Dissenters pass for no Christians, and put all thoughts of reconciling them to us far out of view: And several little books were spread about the Nation, to prove the necessity for re-baptizing them, and that they were in a state of Damnation till that was done; but few were, by these Arguments, prevailed upon to be re-baptized: This struck even at the Baptism by Midwives in the Church of Rome; which was practised and connived at here in England, 'till it was objected in the Conference, held at Hampton-Court, soon after King James the First's Accession to the Crown.

He adds in his final chapter, in the course of his address to the clergy:[3]

---

[1] *Life of Frampton*, edited by T. Simpson Evans, 1876, p. 203.
[2] Edition 1833, vol. vi, pp. 124–5.
[3] Ibid., pp. 194–5.

> to speak plainly; Dodwell's extravagant Notions, which have been too much drunk in by the Clergy in my time, have weakened the Power of the Church, and soured Men's minds more against it, than all the Books wrote, or Attempts made against it, could ever have done: And indeed the secret Poison of those Principles has given too many of the Clergy a Bias towards Popery, with an Aversion to the Reformation, which has brought them under much Contempt. This is not to be recovered, but by their living and labouring, as they ought to do, without an eager maintaining of Arguments for their Authority, which will never succeed, 'till they live better and labour more.

Henry Dodwell was a lay theologian who as a young man resigned his fellowship at Trinity College, Dublin, because he doubted his own fitness to take Holy Orders. After a while we find him in London, working on patristic and other antiquarian subjects, and on matters of controversy between the churches, for the assistance of his close friends among the Caroline divines, William Lloyd, afterwards Bishop of St Asaph and of Worcester, John Pearson, Bishop of Chester, and Bishop Fell of Oxford. His first large-scale controversial works, *Separation of Churches from Episcopal government, as practised by the present Nonconformists, proved schismatical* (1679),[1] and *A Discourse of the One altar and the One priesthood insisted on by the Ancients in their Disputes against Schism* (1683), stood on solid ground taken from St Cyprian. The Church of England was to be defended against Rome because of the fundamental autonomy and equality of all particular churches; against schismatics, Roman or Protestant, because separation from the local church is separation from the Church herself, and from all her sacraments. The fact that some of the schismatics have rejected episcopacy is a subordinate, though an important, point against them. Dodwell at this stage in his life was prepared to allow that the episcopal power of ordination might once have been vested in presbyteries, and to consider with coolness "the opinion of the modern schools" who followed St Jerome in regarding bishops and priests as one order. But in his *De Jure laicorum Sacerdotali* (1685) he took a very high view of the distinction between the priesthood of the whole Church and the external priesthood of the Christian ministry. Significantly he found that the Jesuit Petavius, the original author of the theory of the development of Christian doctrine, was prepared to give some ground to Grotius, who had argued from various passages in canons of councils, patristic writings, and the Roman martyrology, that in the very early church the celebration of the eucharist by deacons, sub-deacons, and even women, was on the same footing as lay baptism, an irregularity that might be justified by necessity. Dodwell not only pointed to the obscurity of the passages concerned, but argued with considerable effect that in the early church lay and clinical baptism was often doubted and sometimes repeated.

This controversy must have quickened his interest in the sealing which St Cyprian's opponents thought sufficient to complete and confirm schismatical baptisms. This became very important when

[1] Cited extensively in A. J. Mason, *The Church of England and Episcopacy* (1914), pp. 331–5.

developments compelled him to modify his earlier views on schism. In 1688 he was appointed to one of the very few university lectureships that could be held by a layman, the post of Camdenian praelector at Oxford. In this capacity he was confronted after the Revolution with the crisis over the oaths to the new sovereigns. A conscientious Non-juror, but not an active Jacobite, he sought in his *Cautionary Discourse of Schism* to find a way whereby the deprivation of the suspended bishops could be avoided, but when the schism came he may be regarded as the effective leader of the Non-juring party, until in 1710 he brought back the body of moderate Non-jurors, who had always remained in close touch with the Establishment, into the communion of the Church of England. He owed his extraordinary ascendancy to "his immense learning, his single-hearted piety, and his fascinating personality" which "quite outweighed his eccentricities";[1] and in the evolution of his thinking upon Apostolic succession he carried with him not only the Non-jurors, but those who were beginning to be called the High Church party.

This evolution can be most clearly seen in a book that is clearly addressed to all Tories, in defence of the Occasional Conformity Bill of 1703, *Occasional Communion fundamentally destructive of the discipline of the primitive Catholic Church* (1705).

> For none can pretend it lawful to communicate with the Devil, even occasionally. None can pretend it lawful to communicate with the Seven Devils of an Apostate, if it was unlawful to communicate with the single devil, which was supposed to be in him before his Baptism. But this Reasoning proceeds much more strongly against Local Schismaticks against the unquestionable Authority of the Jurisdiction when the Schism was first made, which was the case of our Non-conformists. Their Separation was not in favour of any Government that could claim a better title than that which they found actually in possession. It was not in favour of one Bishop who might pretend a better Title, by the Laws of Succession, than could be pleaded for him whom they deserted. Had it been so, there might have been a Subjection to Christ's visible Substitutes pleadable on both sides, if the Question had only been, what Person had the better title to be that visible Substitute. The Proof in such a case might depend on facts of so secret Cognizance as might very easily be mistaken by very well-meaning Persons to the visible Government of the Church in this Life. . . . Our Adversaries Case is such, as, if it may be allowed to Pass into a Precedent, will overthrow the whole Right of Christ of governing his visible Church by visible Substitutes. So that, unless he be pleased to interpose immediately by New Revelations attested by New Miracles, they will not suffer him to provide for the good Government of his Church by any general Establishments to be deriv'd to Posterity (as others of the like kind are usually) by Rulers of lawful Succession. They . . . have overthrown the whole Order of Episcopacy, and therefore, to be sure, the lawful, as well as the unlawful Successors. They have not done this by any regular Appeal to any Superior Judicatory allowed by the Church to judge the cause between Episcopacy and their own new invented Forms of Government. They knew the Order of Episcopacy was universally receiv'd as Supream, and unaccountable to any superior Judicatory on Earth, in relation to its Spirituals. . . . This is a far more evident Case when the whole Dispute is between Spiritual Authority and such as are Subjects indisputably by the Constitution in being, than if it were between two pretended

[1] J. H. Overton, *The Nonjurors* (1902), p. 232.

> Authorities, as it is in the Schisms of whole Churches. Each of such parties may act *bona fide*, and design really to retain their Duty to Christ if the Evidence be indeed litigious for proving who has the Plea to Christ's Authority. The case is far less excusable from the Charge of open Hostility, where there can be no Plea of Authority by the present Constitution.[1]

Dodwell's vehemence reveals the embarrassment of a schismatic who had himself set up altar against altar, but on behalf of duly consecrated bishops uncanonically deprived for loyalty to their legitimate king. The Presbyterians, on the other hand, can

> pretend nothing for their new Establishments but Violence, and Violence from Persons in no way authoriz'd by Christ to represent, or conclude, him. Violence from the Presbyters who had received all the Power they truly had from the Bishops, and had never received any Power but what was dependent and subordinate to them who gave it. . . . Violence from the Magistrates, who cannot, in the least, pretend to Spiritual Power, without whom, and against whom, it was maintain'd in the purest and most flourishing times of the Christian Religion.[2]

This last sentence shows that the fate of the Episcopal Church in Scotland was much upon Dodwell's mind. His *Epistolary Discourse* (1706) is based on correspondence with a Scottish Episcopalian. In this lengthy work

> Proving, from the Scriptures and the first Fathers, that the Soul is a Principle Naturally Mortal, but Immortalized actually by the Pleasure of God, to Punishment; or, to Reward, by its Union with the Divine Baptismal Spirit. Wherein is proved, that None have the Power of giving this Divine Immortalizing Spirit, since the Apostles, but only the BISHOPS.[3]

Dodwell makes a sharp distinction between a merely "purgative" water-Baptism and the Baptism of the Spirit. Both require episcopal authority, but

> That higher Baptism had, in the first Monuments of the Church, another Symbol, by which the Spirit was signified and conferred, distinct from the Symbol of Water, that of Oil. . . . We do not find any beginning of this Symbol of Unction in the very early Ecclesiastical Monuments, which mention it. Nor could there have been so great consent of the Primitive Churches in using it, if it had descended from any other Original but that of Tradition derived from the Apostles.[4]

He was prepared to allow the Eastern custom of chrismation with oil consecrated by a bishop, but he maintains

> So clear it is, that the right of conferring the Spirit was Originally in Bishops, and none but Bishops; and that the right of Presbyters to do it was later, and no more than they could derive from the Conversion of Bishops, in whom it was Originally. This obliges all, who will pretend to the Spirit, to a strict dependence on them, and is alone sufficient, by the Reasonings, even of those best and purest Ages, to oblige all to depend on the Bishops, who desire a solid Title to the Good and Divine Spirit.[5]

This argument from oil was not very suitable for Anglican use. It was handled very cautiously by Charles Wheatley in his influential *Rational Illustration of the Book of Common Prayer* (1710). But the main point of Dodwell's contention, that Baptism, to be valid, must

[1] *Occasional Communion*, pp. 181–7. See also *De Nupero Schismati Anglicano Paraenesis ad exteros* (1704).
[2] *Occasional Communion*, pp. 183–4.
[3] Title-page.
[4] *Epistolary Discourse*, p. 289.
[5] Ibid. p. 297.

be given in an episcopal church, and to be completed must be confirmed by the laying-on-of-hands, was repeated again and again in a series of books and pamphlets between 1710 and 1714. Eighteen, with appropriate replies, are listed in Warwick Elwin's *The Minister of Baptism* (1889).[1] The most significant are criticized in Joseph Bingham's *Scholastical History of the practice of the Church in reference to the administration of Baptism by Laymen* (1712–14), and in other pamphlets included in the eighth volume of his *Origines Ecclesiasticae*.[2]

At this time the High Church party were living under the long shadow of the Hanoverian succession. They had seen their brethren rabbled out of the Scottish manses, and the security of the Presbyterian Church of Scotland written indelibly into the Act of Union. They were ready to receive any argument that lowered the status of English Presbyterians, many of whom they rightly suspected of Unitarian opinions, and of other "enthusiasts", Independents, Baptists, and Quakers, whose tolerated Conventicles broke up the parish community and shook the foundations of the parish priest's authority. It is not at all surprising that the opinion of the invalidity of lay baptism persisted under the Georges, and carried with it a distrust and fear of all lay ministrations, pastoral or sacramental, that was at least a factor in the alienation of the High Church clergy from the Methodist movement. As late as 1842 the redoubtable Bishop Phillpotts, "Henry of Exeter", attacked in a charge to his diocese the sentence on a Lincolnshire clergyman recently suspended for refusing Christian burial to a baby baptized by a Wesleyan minister.[3] Lathbury in his *History of the Nonjurors* (1845) assumes that most Anglican clergymen still agree with the bishop in denying the validity of lay baptism.

On this point the Tractarians modified the tradition, but in the doctrine of the Apostolic succession they stood on the ground marked out by Dodwell, who is summarized by one of his contemporaries as saying that "where they want episcopal ordination they have no ministry, no sacraments, no Church, are out of the Covenant of grace".[4] This is not Caroline, for most of the Caroline divines, like the Scottish bishops in 1661–2, accepted the validity of Presbyterian ordinations.[5] But neither is it a Tractarian innovation. It is one of "Dodwell's extravagant notions".

Dodwell's notions of episcopal origins are given in his *De nupero Schismate Anglicano Paraenesis ad exteros* (1704), and do much to explain the insistence of the Non-jurors, in their correspondence with the Eastern Patriarchs, on the original primacy of Jerusalem. He believed that the episcopal government of the whole Church was exercised by our Lord's kindred until the early years of the second

[1] *Epistolary Discourse*, pp. 258–62. [2] Edition of 1844.
[3] Warwick Elwin, op. cit., pp. 254–6.
[4] In *An Eirenicon of the Eighteenth Century* (1704), edited by H. N. Oxenham, 1879, p. 293.
[5] E.g., among those selected by the Tractarians for the Anglo-Catholic library of theology, Andrewes, Bramhall, Cosin, Crakanthorp, Forbes, Gunning, Laud, Overall, Thorndike, at least.

century. Then the remnant of the Apostolic college, in exile at Ephesus, established bishops over every presbytery in place of the one at Jerusalem.

GEORGE EVERY, S.S.M.

The Just Tax—II

ALTHOUGH the question of the *purpose* of taxation and consent to it has been taken first and at greatest length, that of its *constitution* —the nature of the stuff which is demanded of the taxpayer—is of no less, though of less obvious, moral importance.

The old church tithes, paid in kind, provide a good example of a tax essentially just in constitution. Here again the cause of trouble was primarily the absence of consent to their purpose; but assuming that it be agreed that the clergy should be freed from physical production, there is nothing intrinsically unjust in the payment of part of the produce of the land for their maintenance. The debt is always payable in bad times as in good, and need never accumulate, placing the debtor in the power of the creditor. The husbandman in order to support the parson must either consume a little less or work a little harder. This is in accordance with natural law and the belief that the soil, rightly treated, will produce enough for all. The same arguments may be applied to the maintenance of a properly constituted government.

But the inconvenience of such a payment in kind in a money economy becomes intolerable, and it would clearly be unjust to demand payment in, say, wheat, from a city dweller. The convenience and benefit to both parties of substituting a fixed payment in money for a proportional payment in kind are so obvious that other consequences of using this medium commonly escape notice. Money is not a thing created by God, nor is it produced or obtainable by the taxpayer from Nature, but is a pure artifact, a numerical expression of "credit" or belief, created and controlled by a very restricted group of men. The conditions under which this medium, indispensable to taxpayers and all other debtors, may be obtained from those who bring it into existence inescapably determine whether or not, in the aggregate, demands for money such as taxes can be met in full without injustice and without merely transferring the debt elsewhere.

If the money system reflects, as closely as the wit of man can devise, the real nature of the created world and its potentialities, whatever is naturally possible will also be financially possible, and a tax which is payable in produce will be no greater burden in money as well as being more convenient. But it is painfully clear that this correspondence between the real world and the financial world has never been closely approached, and never less so than to-day, when we have "managed" currencies reflecting only the judgment and the will of certain men.

Unfortunately the defenders and custodians of knowledge about

the modern financial system do not make it easy to understand its moral basis, and many of those church people who in recent years have inquired into this important subject have been confused and discouraged from pressing their inquiry by a babel of technical arguments, controversial opinions and expert pronouncements. It is most sincerely to be hoped that this article will not start any such discussion. It is not the technics or the economics but the faith and morals of the matter which urgently require the attention of Christian people.

The fundamental fact, from the Christian point of view, about the modern money system is that it denies the redemption of debt; and therefore denies deliverance from that temptation which debt brings to bear upon debtors. Money, nowadays, is virtually synonymous with financial credit, which comes into existence only as a debt repayable to the issuers, so that by its very nature such debt is irredeemable and must increase and accumulate power in the hands of the creditors; although of course, in each particular case, the debtor may free himself by transferring the burden to others. This terrible moral strain permeates all that part of life into which monetary considerations enter.

It is also a fact that modern governments finance their day-to-day expenditure, not out of taxation as is commonly supposed, but by incurring debt which it is the function of taxation to repay. The power to tax, in other words, is the security upon which the loans are raised, which is one powerful reason why compulsion must be used; for since debts in general can never be met in full, compulsion is the only way in which governments can ensure that their own liabilities are met in full, so that they remain "credit-worthy".

There is no possibility of justice when taxation is levied in such a medium, obtainable in the first place only as debt, manipulable as to value, and bearing an inverted relationship to the real potentialities of the world. It has not yet been forgotten that, within living memory, physical plenty has been accompanied by widespread monetary poverty; that the threat of the return of such a state of affairs still dominates the political scene; and that the floodgates of financial credit have been opened widely only for destruction. It is not long since the value of the pound in terms of the dollar was radically changed by edict, so that, to comply with the will and judgment of certain men whose identity is not generally known, a whole nation had suddenly to provide some 50 per cent. more work for a given return. A tax payable on these terms is merely a means of power over the taxed, and in recent years taxation has been used quite openly as a means of controlling the lives of the taxpayers, rather than purely as a source of revenue for the purposes of government.

This process has reached its culmination in the U.S.S.R., where tax and price have become scarcely distinguishable, being manipulated from day to day by Government edict for the purpose of controlling consumption according to plan. The winter surcharge imposed on domestic consumers in 1949 by the British Electricity

Authority was of the same nature. There seems to be no challenge from any moral authority to the right of the Exchequer annually to manipulate the personal and cultural habits of the people—their eating, drinking, smoking, amusements, the quality of goods they buy, even the design of motor-cars, houses, and other things. The whole structure of life is distorted and interfered with by taxation: if the robin on a Christmas card has a red breast it bears a higher rate of purchase tax; the owner of a piece of waste land must certify that he has committed "no act of husbandry" upon it if he is to escape property tax; the building or improvement of many homes is penalized or prevented by development charge and increased rating assessments. But taxation is also openly used to destroy independence, to concentrate power, and to bring about social changes—the African whose money is cattle has had to work in the white man's plantations to get the wherewithal to pay his poll tax. The heirs or executors of the English landowner must break up his estates in order to pay death duties, deliberately levied for that purpose at a rate which could not be met out of the current produce of the land. The control of such bodies as the universities is passing to the Government by the simple process of so reducing the net incomes of their staffs by taxation that they have to be made up again by grants of "public money".

But the tax which is most subtle, pervasive, and radical, in its social effects is the purely monetary tax of inflation—the modern equivalent of coin clipping—which undermines continually the value of all fixed endowments, and must in time deprive all traditional institutions, and notably the Established Church, of their property and financial independence.

The worried look which is nowadays habitual to the parish priest as he goes about his business is not unrelated to these facts, and though an understanding of them will not help to solve his financial difficulties, it will enable him to face them with a clearer mind and a greater courage. A known enemy is less formidable than an unknown, and, though it is not usual to think about it in this way, a false credit system must necessarily rest upon a false faith which is at variance with the Christian faith, and which is all the more powerful when it is taken for granted. It can scarcely be denied that the great challenge to the faith of this age is what is usually called the economic challenge, but which is more correctly called the financial. A money system cannot serve two masters, or two functions. It cannot be an accurate reflection in accountancy of the created world, enabling whatever can be done to be done, whatever can be made to be bought, and all just debts to be redeemed in full, and at the same time a means of power and control over the lives of men. The redemption of debt has more than a verbal bearing upon the redemption of men.

It may be that, unless the Church becomes more fully aware of the weapon which is being used against her, she will be forced back to the last ditch of her defence in poverty, celibacy, and martyrdom. For credit is a thing which ought to lie within the field of religion

and moral authority; and the crying need of the world is for a credit system which is not a means of centralized power, and which possesses in its policy and principles that integrity which we rely upon in the administration of our local branch bank. There was a time when money was issued under the authority of the Church, and it may be that something of the sort may again be necessary. But to prevail against the terrible weapon of a false credit a faith is needed deeper and stronger, as a motive of action, than the implicit confidence which the ordinary man, even the ordinary churchman, feels in those paper notes, bearing a false promise of the redemption of debt, which symbolize the main operative faith of this world. To avoid misunderstanding it should be added that even a false confidence is better than none, but that a Christian (that is, a debt-redeeming) financial system would be the most beneficent invention of mankind. *Corruptio optimi pessima.*

There remains finally the third aspect of taxation, the *amount*; but this can be dealt with shortly, for in so far as a just tax is a price the amount will be determined by the cost, and any gross excess will be limited by the right to contract out. It is true that the service of an ever-increasing financial debt must progressively inflate taxes as well as other prices beyond their natural limits, but any honest system which brings this fact accurately home to the mind and pocket of the elector and taxpayer will also tend towards the application of the remedy.

There is however a basic part of taxation to which these considerations of cost cannot be applied fully—namely, that part which supplies the maintenance of the Government, or of the clergy, or of other people whose duty it is to serve the community in ways which could never be entirely computed in money or wealth. Here it is possible to say only that *custom* supplies the answer. St Thomas Aquinas[1] quotes Tully's *Rhetoric* as follows: *"that justice has its source in nature; thence certain things came into custom by reason of their utility; afterwards these things which emanated from nature and were approved by custom, were sanctioned by fear and reverence for the law".*

Certainly the inconstancy of modern taxation with its innumerable arbitrary changes, destroying faith and security in personal arrangements and undertakings, is utterly at variance with natural law, custom, and morality. Trollope shows in *The Warden* how the mere threat of a legalistic justice could destroy the peace and happiness both of the old bedesmen in the almshouse with their 1s. 6d. a day, and of the warden in his comfortable home with his £800 a year derived also from the charitable bequest; yet it can scarcely be denied that this division of the bequest represented an injustice, but not one of which the warden was guilty. The harking back to ancient wrongs at the expense of a settlement established by custom seems always to increase the injustice.

[1] *Sum. Theol.*, Q. 91, Art. 3. The Dominican English translation VIII, 13, 1942.

This idea of justice applied to the question which first stimulated the writing of this article, as to what constitutes a just limit to taxation, cannot give any simple or quantitative answer; but the amount of one-tenth formerly accepted for tithes has behind it the weight of long-established custom, and may therefore be helpful in indicating what must be a reasonably just proportion.

It may be taken for granted that almost any expert on modern government and finance would say that the suggestions here put forward are hopelessly impracticable; but that is merely a statement of adherence to a different belief. All society hangs utterly upon faith, whether the faith be false or true, and the Church ought not to abandon her proper ground because the politician and the economist have invaded it.

The writer is painfully aware of his unfitness to present this subject to the readers of THEOLOGY, and begs others who are better equipped to criticize and to clarify the moral considerations involved; but if the image of rightness is to be held up to the world it must be defined in practical terms; and if it is right, it is practicable, and requires only faith to bring it about.

GEOFFREY DOBBS.

(*Concluded.*)

The Parish Priest as Preacher

THE series of articles on "Great Preachers" suggests a consideration of the vocation of the "general practitioner". The present writer has listened to many of the great preachers—Boyd Carpenter, Scott Holland, Gore, Stanton, Archbishop Lang, Canon Body, Frank Weston, and many more, but would unhesitatingly say that the most effective preachers have been parish priests, often in obscure posts and unknown outside their immediate districts.

There was a time when the very word "sermon" was a byword for dullness. There were the "stars" like Canon Knox Little or Father Maturin, who drew great congregations from all quarters, but the Victorian average was mediocre and sermons apt to be platitudinous.

Then followed a period which coincided roughly with the incumbency of the Rev. H. F. B. Mackay at All Saints', Margaret Street, when the parish priest came into his own. Sermons were brief and businesslike, and the purple patches and studied eloquence of the earlier generation were laid aside. There was loss as well as gain. Oratory is a real art and even the phlegmatic British are swayed by it. It would be revealing to learn the number of Welsh preachers who fill the Free Churches in England. John Bull distrusts eloquence, but he is occasionally moved by it. However, the practical, straightforward sermon became the fashion, and it would not be an ill-founded boast to say that the average Anglican sermon reached a level of some distinction in its own particular style. It is sufficient to recall the sermons delivered Sunday by Sunday at such churches as St John the Divine, Kennington, or St Mary's, Bourne Street, to

endorse the comment of a worshipper at the latter who said: "You can go there any Sunday in the year and never hear a poor sermon." It was equally true of "down-town" churches in the slums. Dr Orchard, the well-known Congregational preacher who later joined the Roman Church, declared that the best sermons were preached in East End churches. We can well believe it, in the days when H. V. S. Eck was at Bethnal Green, Dick Sheppard at the Oxford House, and Cyril Bickersteth and W. H. Frere in Stepney. The novelist of East London, W. Pett Ridge, was an admirer of the preaching of Father Le Couteur, of St Columba's, Haggerston, and not far off was the Rev. Osborn Jay, who figures in *The Child of the Jago*, by another East End novelist, Arthur Morrison.

There were many equally good preachers in the Provinces. In Birmingham the Sunday evening sermon by the Rev. Arnold Prichard was often reported in the local press, and there were outstanding preachers in churches of all schools of thought.

But the level has declined. The shortage of clergy is responsible for a lack of attention to the craft of preaching. A priest who had been Select Preacher at his University told us that he had some difficulty in obtaining a curacy because the qualifications demanded were entirely those requisite for youth work.

The average incumbent is occupied with finance, while the average assistant is kept busy by youth organizations. Neither gets a chance to work at the task of presenting the Gospel persuasively, let alone impressively. Thirty years ago it was fondly hoped that the inauguration of Church Councils would relieve the clergy of some of the tasks laid upon them, but whatever the merits of these bodies, it cannot be said that they have succeeded in this aim. It will be tragic if the necessity of being harassed by problems of maintenance should unfit the clergy for their proper task. All might ponder some words of the Bishop of Southwark in his recent Visitation Charge: "All through my Visitation last year I was brought up against the vital need of congregations which are well instructed in the essentials of their faith. . . . A teaching sermon need be neither dull nor highbrow; it can always be adapted to the particular level and experience of a congregation, and must always be closely and clearly related to life."

It is to be hoped that the study of the Great Preachers whose personalities and methods have been described in THEOLOGY will lead to a revival of interest and endeavour. In London a Preachers' Group has been at work for over eight years studying the subject of the Christian message and its presentation, and similar groups should be encouraged everywhere.

MARCUS DONOVAN.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

Mr Nicholls is the author of *Ecumenism and Catholicity*, which was reviewed in the September number of THEOLOGY.

Mr MacKinnon is Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Aberdeen.

Brother George Every is a member of the Society of the Sacred Mission at Kelham.

Dr Dobbs is Senior Lecturer in Forest Botany at the University College of North Wales.

The Rev. M. Donovan is Vicar of Benhilton, Surrey.

CORRESPONDENCE

MALE AND FEMALE

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

Your contributor to the June number of THEOLOGY, in writing of the vexed question of the subordination of woman to man, does not appear to have noticed that subordination exists in the very Being of God, in whose image, we were reminded, male and female are made. According to the ante-Nicene doctrine of "Monarchia", there is an eternal principle of order in the Trinity in which the Father takes first place. And yet "none is greater or less than another; but the whole Three Persons are . . . co-equal". When it is remembered that this subordination arises from the Father's being the Origin from whom the Son and Spirit proceed (cf. Eve's supposed origin from Adam), an analogy is apparent. Though the analogy cannot be pressed far, does it not suggest that Barth's third proposition is right, at least in essence? That man has a "monarchia" over the woman, without prejudice to the complete equality of the sexes? The *raison-d'être*, the limitations and the nature of this human monarchia then begin to become apparent—and not, I trust, objectionable!

J. N. KEITH GIBSON.

ST MARY'S RECTORY,
ST KITTS, B.W.I.
20 *August* 1952.

"THE NEW EVE"

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

With reference to the letter from Mr Radcliffe on pp. 399 f. of the October number of THEOLOGY, I am glad to see that the editor (not to say author) of *The New Eve* acknowledges every one of the points I mentioned. No one will be surprised that his fatherly concern for his book makes him express them in a kindlier way than I did. As regards the last point on which he takes me up, I can only refer readers to his text and leave them to judge whether the patronizing attitude he adopts pays so much honour to Newman as he thinks.

Yours, etc.,

L. BOUYER
of the Oratory.

COLLÈGE LIBRE DE JUILLY,
SEINE-ET-MARNE.

BOOK REVIEWS

English Casuistical Divinity during the Seventeenth Century. By Thomas Wood. S.P.C.K. 12s. 6d.

These three lectures are an introduction to English, not just to Anglican, moral theology in the seventeenth century. Mr Wood shows by extracts from their books how Perkins, Ames, and Baxter, shared the better-known views of the Anglican writers and made common cause with them on most fundamental aspects of the subject. Both were convinced that neglect of "practical divinity" was a real impoverishment and that the absence of a reformed manual was a grave lack. The chief figure in this book is Jeremy Taylor, with Richard Baxter occupying second place. This is natural, since these two wrote more concerning actual cases and problems of practice than did the others, and Mr Wood is concerned with presenting this aspect of moral theology to us, while giving due acknowledgment to the fact that the period was primarily occupied with fundamentals. Principles rather than precedents were the chief interest. This was inevitable since, as their various prefaces show, Anglican and Separatist alike desired some radical reforms. In his first chapter the author outlines the views of Ames, Perkins, Baxter, and Taylor, on the nature and purpose of moral theology, and refers to the way in which they handled the medieval material. The second chapter speaks of their teaching on conscience and law, noting their debt to Aquinas. The third section of this chapter contains three instances of how the seventeenth century dealt with certain problems in "the casuistry of economic conduct". This is a particularly interesting part of the book and an aspect of the subject which we hope Mr Wood will develop in the larger work upon which, as he tells us, he is engaged. There is also a good discussion of the seventeenth-century approach to the problem of lying and equivocation, which constitutes the first division of Chapter III. For the remainder of the chapter, he leaves matters of practice and turns to the principles underlying his authors' treatment of the questions of mortal and venial sin and repentance.

As we survey the six or seven English writers of the period who concentrated on this subject (although even in their cases not exclusively) their very fewness might make us forget that this constituted no true gauge of contemporary interest. For the seventeenth century was an age of diffused moral theology. One aspect or another of it is continually cropping up in books and in conferences and particularly in sermons. Indeed, bishops saw to it that this was so. Taylor himself advised his clergy to this effect and the type of sermons he preached at the Golden Grove witnesses to his own practice. There is a sense in which it is true to say that the period had more moral theology than moral theologians. That, however, is all the more reason for not neglecting those we have, and it may be said at once of Mr Wood's book that it ought to encourage his readers to study Taylor and Hall and Baxter for themselves. He has also reminded

us of the wide range of problems which they faced in a world which was conforming more and more to a new economic pattern. The only fault to be found with the book is its brevity, and that is indirectly a tribute.

H. R. McAdoo.

The Claim of Morality. By N. H. G. Robinson. Gollancz. 21s.

It is most refreshing to find two books of such quality as *Faith and Duty* and *The Claim of Morality* coming from a Scottish manse, amid the perturbations and preoccupations of a working minister in the aftermath of war. The former was noticed in Theology of March 1951 (pp. 106–8) as "an important book which will be carefully and widely studied". The latter is also an important book, equally deserving careful study. It is emphatically not a popular book, and as Professor Macmurray says in the Introduction it is "not an easy book". It will not reveal its secrets in an odd moment on a railway journey. And to a casual reader its endless distinctions, where it is sometimes difficult to detect real differences, may hide its real merits. An atom-splitting age needs more than a hair-splitting ethic. But careful study and deeper knowledge of the subject reveal the penetrating analyses and subtle insights of which this book is full, so full that it provokes Macmurray into using the word "serious" seven times in the first page of his Introduction!

The book is divided into two almost equal parts, of which the first is a historical survey of British ethical thinking from Hobbes to the present day—the sentimentalism and the rationalism of the eighteenth century, utilitarianism, the ethics of idealism, and the new intuitionism. Of the first three of these at least it might be said that they are horses that have been dead so long that no amount of flogging could provide interest for anyone save a historian. Surprisingly, and almost disconcertingly, Dr Robinson shows their problems and attempted solutions to be of permanent and directly contemporary relevance. Most important of all, he shows how the thought of each is complementary to the other as each set himself to a different version of the problem. Each found an answer, none *the* answer. On the excellent and fresh interpretation and analysis of each school of thought we would comment only that it was the late Professor A. S. Pringle-Pattison (not mentioned by Dr Robinson) who first, in this country at any rate, uncovered the clay feet of the Hegelian ethic, in his *Hegelianism and Personality*.

In Part Two Dr Robinson reformulates the problem or problems, and proceeds to an acute discrimination of the relations of rightness and goodness, duty and virtue. "It is just not the case that the student of ethics is confronted by a variety of answers to a fixed and definite problem" (p. 179). "In ethics the problem is to discover what are the facts" (p. 180). While "moral judgments cannot be logically derived from metaphysical or scientific truths" (p. 181), these moral judgments do "represent an insight into reality" (p. 182) and not mere capricious and arbitrary subjective notions. But the previous examin-

ation of historical formulations warns us that it is impossible to equate rightness and goodness even by tracing both to a source in the will of God. It is impossible to summarize Dr Robinson's argument, in which he examines the contributions of Sir David Ross, the late Professor Pritchard, and others, and attempts to determine the relative importance for the moral judgment of the motive and the intention, the act and its consequences, virtue and duty, the character and the circumstances of the agent, with an almost overwhelming capacity for sustained abstract thinking, in which he soars into an atmosphere so rarefied that the wings of feebler mortals will no longer flap.

The book ends with a conclusion that will close the issue for no one, but we hope will stimulate the author and provoke his readers into fresh explorations. "To which . . . of the three main types of ethical theory does this account of the matter belong? The answer is that it belongs to none of them. It does not find the ground of rightness in the moral goodness of motives, nor does it find it exactly in the character of the acts themselves, nor again in the goodness of the consequences of acts. It finds it, rather, in an all-inclusive form of life, a comprehensive system of personal relationships, which is *the* good, the ideal" (p. 329).

St Andrews. W. R. Forrester.

Is God in History? By Gerald Heard. Faber. 15s.
Time and Mankind. By S. G. F. Brandon. Hutchinson. 18s.

These two books are very different, and difficult to hold together in the mind; indeed, the effort to do so has raised a problem in time for the Editor and the reviewer. Gerald Heard describes the entire course of biological and human development in terms of Fall and Redemption. He traces this pattern through three stages. The first was when the unicellular organism "fell" into multicellularity and consequent specialization. Whether the first stage of this "fall" means anything is doubtful. Heard himself admits that no existing unicellular organism shows any sign of entering upon "a continually expanding reciprocation with the whole depth and span of the environment"; the only evidence of the "might have been" is that the yeasts are alleged, alone among living things, to reverse entropy and produce more energy than they consume. At this point death entered into the world, and the first "redemption" is represented by sexual reproduction whereby every species reverts between the generations to unicellularity and secures for itself a relatively fresh start. Mr Heard's readers will already be familiar with his views on the "fallenness" of animals as shown in various premature specializations, each of which meant a halt to the possibility of further evolutionary advance. The most impressive instances are not lions, whose jaws are too strong to let them think, nor horses, whose hooves can never hold anything, but horrible parasites like the rhizocephala, which has reduced itself to no more than a nutritive and reproductive system.

The second, the first human fall, into Wrong Attention, is due to greed and lust, whereby the individual loses the primitive apprehension of the nutritional and reproductive cycles—only little children, like most animals, know what and how much to eat. This is redeemed by the Tradition, at first chiefly ritual, whereby the primitive unity is reasserted, between man and man, inner and outer, man and the universe. Later stages show further falls, as the mind of man divides further what nature had joined, pursuing power for its own sake (which is worse than for appetite), smoking and drinking (which are worse than gluttony); even mathematics and the alphabet as means of analysis aid the disintegration of man from nature and man in himself. Corresponding partial redemptions are effected by laws and customs, which eventually ossify and produce revolutions, by prophets and ethical reformers, who do not go deep enough. And finally unhappy man seeks release through alcoholic excess, meat eating, war (marks of the "heroic" age) and the bestial rites of Bacchism and lycanthropy. This is the third fall, into false psychological cures.

The world's great religions are redemptive answers. Mankind fissured into individuals obsessed by addictions:—to that original Buddhism was an adequate answer. Vedanta went nearest to meeting the total need, but failed to recognize the universality and reality of evil and the consequent necessity of a more than human Saviour. It was reserved for the religiously backward West to receive the final Redemption in which myth and history are united; the Saviour is an actual Person who fulfils in fact all the redemptive myths, is himself one with the Creator, and by birth from a virgin breaks the biological entail.

Is God in history? Men will always find that he is, if they yield themselves to be instruments in his redemption; they will believe that he always has been, as they trace out the working of his inexhaustible patience; and they will believe that "whenever man falls there his redemption will remanifest itself—at whatever increased cost, achieving a still more profound redemption".

Dr Brandon's learned work describes mankind's efforts through the ages to come to terms with time and make sense of his own being within it. For practical purposes (agriculture and the like), man observes and records the recurrent patterns of events; hence arises the cyclic theory. From early days there are signs too of attempts at the magic or ritual perpetuation of the past; man as it were keeps a hold on significant past events and persons by re-presenting them. This is the meaning of the long-lived cult of Osiris in Egypt, whose death and resurrection were ritually represented, and ensured a like blessed immortality for those who had the correct ceremonies performed. On the other hand, Egypt found no meaning in the process of history itself—the gigantic monuments of the past spoke only of universal passing away. The Babylonians and other dwellers in Mesopotamia could record history over long periods, but found no purpose in it, only a cyclic determinism which suited their astrology and to their inconclusive wars.

It was the Hebrews who elaborated a (to them) satisfying philosophy of history, whereby everything that had happened in time from the Creation onward was claimed for the control of Yahveh, and centred in their own achievements. This naturally involved a tendentious rewriting of ancient legends, and the basic achievement must be attributed to the unknown author of "J", to whom "we may be permitted to refer as an individual writer of genius". It was he who formed the *Heilsgeschichte* out of the *Urgeschichte*, the *Vaetertradition* and the *Auszug-Landnahmetradition*. The setting in which this was valued was the *Zwoelfstaemmeamphiktyonie*, whereby the twelve tribes were fused into one nation in the worship of their common God. This stage reached its fulfilment in the triumph of David; and for that very reason the faith was at once in danger. "It could play no static role as that of other religions. It must either renew its purpose on some larger stage or perish." This was achieved through the Prophets, notably Jeremiah, who helped to re-establish the damaged prestige of Yahveh after the disaster to Josiah, and by extending the scope of the old Heilsgeschichte to include his interpretation of Yahveh's activity in the sending of the prophets made it possible to contemplate the overthrow of Israel as a manifestation of Yahveh's justice. Other aspects of the transformation are seen in Ezekiel and Deutero-Isaiah. The belief in Yahveh's care for Israel, after Yahveh had explicitly become the God of the whole earth, survived all disappointments and disasters, and led logically to the fatal revolt of A.D. 68. Isaiah 53 in this view expresses a doctrine of despair.

(We are possibly reconciled to *Weltanschauung*. By why need we encumber English sentences with German words twenty-four letters long?—unless it is to show that, as once in New Testament studies, so now in Semitic origins, whatever comes out of Germany must be the last word in ruthless iconoclasm and fearless reconstruction?)

The Romans made history, but in spite of Vergil never found a purpose in it. The Greeks studied history, and knew too much about it to fancy that it had one. Instead, they sought release for individuals through mystery religions and the technique of escape.

Christianity inherited from Israel a conviction about the providential government of history, and the first Jewish Christians were eager to remember their Lord and to exhibit him as Messiah. But Paul from the first was not at all interested in the historical Jesus; he propagated a sacramental mystery religion whose "Christ" has no real human life or situation. Paul's interpretation was defeated during his lifetime by "the astute James" and he was arrested and imprisoned. Only after the fall of Jerusalem his writings were disinterred, and the Gospels were written to identify the historical Jesus with the Son of God as preached by Paul. (There is surely some tendentious exaggeration here; the thesis is elaborated in Dr Brandon's earlier book.)

The Church ever since has had difficulty in reconciling the two strands of its tradition. By taking over Paul's doctrine of the godly remnant as identified with the Church, the Church strove to focus

all history upon itself, and at the same time to mediate a system of individual salvation out of this world, by the ancient method of ritual perpetuation of the past. In medieval Christendom both these elements were combined into a well-articulated whole, both lines meeting in the Last Judgment.

This has now broken up. The historical scheme with its roots in the nationalism of the Jews has been too narrow to adapt itself to the immense vistas opened up by science, and the expectation, even the desire, of immortality has faded out. Dr Brandon hopes that some way of reinterpreting the traditional Christian ethos may be found, which will validate the essential teleology, without which man ceases to be rational, and even that this may take place before communism makes it impossible.

These two books, different as they are, witness to the same fact: our eschatology is in a muddle. Immortality as an operative belief is thought of as applying to the individual as such—and we have no imaginatively satisfying answer to Mr Hoyle's question "How do Christians propose to spend eternity?" Nor is this integrated with the recovered "emphasis" of the new Biblical theology on the redemption of history, whether through the historical process or by catastrophe. Moreover, in so far as Christianity still has power to influence conduct on anything like a wide scale, it is the former consideration which actually works. The redemption of history, even the rendering of history reasonably tolerable, seems to be outside the range where our efforts can be effective, and the catastrophic "summing up" is not in our control at all; while its place in the imaginative picture is already occupied by the vista of an indefinitely extended future which is even more appalling than the indefinitely extended past.

Dr Brandon traces this fissure in our thinking to its origins in the New Testament and behind; and no depreciation of his efforts is intended if one expresses the conviction that there is more religious power and therefore more hope in Gerald Heard's approach, who, while seemingly "careless of the single life", shows a profound sense of the whole mysteriously guided process out of which the consciousness of each of us has emerged, against which we so often vainly struggle, and (to say the least) in harmony with which we can alone attain our destiny.

T. R. Milford.

Lincoln.

Three Mystics. Edited by Father Bruno de J. M., O.D.C. Sheed and Ward. 25s.

It is almost a commonplace that art (or, rather, significant art) is essentially revelatory of the extra-material, and of *Zeitgeist* in particular. Nevertheless, to the philistine—especially apt, with us, to retreat upon the puritan strain in our English inheritance by way of excusing insensibility—art is a merely decorative and somewhat questionable extra, like illustrations to a novel. The aesthetic

solecisms one encounters with such depressing frequency in churches are indicative of how many illiterates in the language of the arts (including music) have charge of an intrinsically beautiful heritage, without adequate apprehension of the religious values of it.

The counter-reformation did not labour under this curious aberration concerning what is in effect an extension of the Incarnation, and there can be no doubt that the Latin church was enabled to hold back the Protestant tide in many places—Austria is a notable example—by the deliberate and astonishing assault upon the senses which it made for religious purposes in the art it fostered. No-one can understand the counter-reform who knows nothing of that extraordinary and pervasive movement of the human spirit covered by the term Baroque, and which embraces painting and sculpture, architecture, gardens and fountains, poetry and homily, music, too, and the drama, predominantly of the Seicento. The use of Spanish Baroque artists to illuminate the writing of contemporary Spanish mystics in this admirable book is thus much more than an embellishment of an anthology with pictures, for the same hypertense ethos shaped and inspired them all. Within a single decade of the late sixteenth century were produced Teresa of Avila's *Interior Castle*; the superb ecstasies of Spain's greatest religious lyrical poet, Juan de la Cruz; and El Greco's *S. Maurice and the Theban Legion* and *The Entombment of Count Orgaz* (perhaps his most superlative work). These are the three mystics of the title, but the pictures include more than forty reproductions of the work of other Spanish artists of the period, including the remarkable polychrome sculpture—peculiar to Spain and little known in this country—of Juan de Juni and his followers, Montañéz and Hernández, and others still less familiar, such as Gaspar Delgado and Juan de Mesa, of Seville, and various unattributed pieces. Indeed, a brief addition to the appendices, of notes on the artists included, with their dates, would have been valuable and enlightening to many.

Roger Fry's essay on El Greco in *Vision and Design* reminds us, with some surprise now, of the considerable public excitement which greeted the acquisition of the *Agony in the Garden* by the National Gallery in 1920 and of the mixture of delight and vituperation it called forth at the time. The Baroque achievement has since become better understood, and our own metaphysical poets have received new recognition in the process, but the fascination of this rich and complex epoch is doubtless still caviare to the general. Nor does everyone find the mystics easy reading, though the discursive theosophical tendencies current at present have given them a certain vogue. Here is a timely presentation of something of both with scholarly supervision and annotation. The Carmel at Montmartre selected the extracts from the two Spanish Doctors, and Bernard Champigneulle (who also contributes an introduction on Theotokopoulos) chose the illustrations. To take the book into retreat would doubtless prove particularly rewarding.

John H. L. Waterson.

Stoke D'Abernon.

MIRACLE AND NATURAL LAW IN GRAECO-ROMAN AND EARLY CHRISTIAN THOUGHT. By Robert M. Grant. North-Holland Publishing Co.

Professor Grant does not concern himself explicitly with the modern debate either about Miracle or about Natural Law. He quotes the observation of *Edelstein* that "the problem of miracles, as they were understood in antiquity, has never been studied in detail". To make such a detailed study is our author's purpose.

Such a wide survey is not easy to make, nor to check. Nor, may the reviewer add, is it easy to read, being compressed and encyclopedic in character. But the author has done his difficult task well, helping his reader as much as possible by providing full references in footnotes, and excellent indices. Further, he has set himself to understand the problems underlying ancient debate about miracles, and tries to elucidate the changing pattern of ancient comment.

His generalizations are few. This, while not making for easy reviewing, does testify to the author's scholarly caution and enhances respect for his judgment. He shows that science in the modern sense of an ordered system of the knowledge of nature, based on close observation and experiment, never took root among educated people in the ancient world. There were noteworthy individual scientists, like Aristotle, there were periods of rational scientific outlook upon the world, as in the late Hellenistic period. But Graeco-Roman culture never assimilated to itself the scientific outlook. Many reasons may be assigned for this. There was the lack of scientific apparatus, the hostile pressure of popular opinion, the abundance of slave labour to discourage technical invention. There was the failure to clarify the boundaries and concepts of science, philosophy and theology, so that science tended to be swamped in other inquiries or to be unduly departmentalized. There was a failure to influence the educational curriculum. But above all there was the persistent *a priori* rationalism of ancient thinkers, their reluctance to make and classify observations, their literary partiality for learning from books.

So there was much credulity, tempered by waves of common-sense criticism. By the first century A.D., however, a decline of science and rise of credulity set in, which steadily increased for four centuries. This, coinciding as it does with the rise of the Christian Church, makes a *prima facie* case for investigation. It is the merit of Prof. Grant's treatment that, while ruthlessly candid, it is not content with the obvious answer—that Christianity is inherently given to credulity and opposed to science. In fact science was already so decadent, so mixed up with magic and gnostic philosophy, so given over to charlatans, when it first came into contact with Christian thinking, that there was no life and hope left in it. It needed to die, otherwise modern science might never have been born.

We shall better understand this if we sense the tensions in the thinking of the early centuries. The early Christian Fathers were not uniformly bent on credulity. Indeed they were commonly classed with atheists as sceptics, because of their steady criticism of superstition. But they were resolutely opposed to the necessitarian views and semi-magical practices of many contemporary "scientists". They

rejected the ancients' confusion of God, Nature and Fate, being pledged to assert the omnipotence of God over nature, and the free responsibility of man. This indispensable religious insight, so pregnant for the ultimate future of humane studies, was the ground of their controversial insistence on Creation *ex nihilo* and their rejection of the universal ancient premises of the eternity of matter and the cycle of history. In defending this position, their own upbringing in classical rationalism, in popular credulity, and in Biblical fundamentalism, led them into strange and untenable defences of nature miracles. But we must never overlook the context of their thinking, and transfer them illegitimately by mental sleight of hand into a twentieth century.

North Creake Rectory, Fakenham.

T. Elliott.

You and Your Nerves. An expanded version of a series of talks in the B.B.C. "Silver Lining" Programme. By H. Guntrip. Allen and Unwin. 8s. 6d.

For many people this book might well prove a turning-point in their lives. No one whose profession brings him into personal contact with the people of this country to-day, whether inside or outside the churches, can be unaware of the prevalent burden of neurotic anxiety. Moreover, the facilities at present offered to the public for the treatment and cure of this distressing malady by the medical and pastoral professions in Britain are about on a par with the facilities offered for the treatment of surgical conditions in the more primitive jungle areas of the tropics. Just here and there a lone worker is to be found who is prepared to direct the attention of his "patient" away from the body to the inner personality conflicts which lie behind the multiform symptomatology of neurosis, hysteria, and anxiety, and who is willing to enter with the patient into the jungle of his fears and frustrations in the confidence that together they can find a way out.

A listener wrote to Mr Guntrip that he suffered from palpitation, trembling, fear of collapse, and fear of death, and said that doctors tell him simply to "forget it". Pains and fears were mixed together, and he added: "No explanations are given to me why I should feel like this. The doctors say it depends on myself to cure myself, but no one tells me how to go about it. What is the first step to take if this is true?"

The fact is that the average doctor doesn't know the answer himself, and the medical course would appear to be skilfully designed to omit any mention of such things as worthy of serious study. When he comes into general practice he is surrounded with patients of this sort. He complains, with some justification, that he has no time to deal with them, but that is not the main reason. Thus it is that the group of drugs most frequently prescribed are bromides and barbiturates, doled out with the infuriating comment that "there's nothing wrong with you. It is all your imagination. It is only nerves." If the

patient is rich, "Get away for a change"; if he is poor, "Just forget about it, hard work is the best cure." Does the training of the clergy leave them any better off than the doctors in this respect? At least Marx would have to admit that the work of supplying dope to the masses has now been transferred from the state church to the state medical service. Mr Guntrip's plea is for less drugs and more understanding.

The discipline of speaking briefly and intelligibly to millions of listeners has enhanced the author's already marked ability to express complex and technical matters in plain English. The arrangement of the talks is the one best suited to the task of leading the person who is aware of "something wrong" to a clear understanding of the chain of causation from the presenting symptoms back to their buried origins. In cogent order he deals with the symptoms and shows their ubiquity in modern life. Then he shows one how to look behind the physical and mental symptoms to their meaning in terms of anxiety and fear. In turn we recognize these anxious fears, the panic that is running away, the terror that dare not move, the exhaustion that has struggled itself to a standstill, as phases in an internal conflict whose roots are buried (as roots generally are). Then he isolates the elements in this conflict; on the one hand the aggressive emotions of hatred, jealousy, anger and temper, and on the other the depressive emotions of guilt, inferiority, gloom, and self-hatred. He then shows these unproductive resentments as mistaken responses to a dilemma of frustration at the thwarting of fundamental personality requirements. Finally he identifies the roots of frustration in the loss, or threat of it, of those loving personal relationships for which every child longs, imperatively and desperately. In a later chapter the dilemma of this emotional deadlock of love and hate towards the same person is shown as forming the childhood foundation of adult depression.

A very wise and balanced chapter on "Sex difficulties" concludes with the affirmation that "it is not from sexuality as such that trouble arises. It is from what is imported into sexuality from our anxieties and resentments that sexual difficulties arise". The following chapter on "Personal Relationships" deals wisely with the childhood origins of marriage tangles.

The talk on "Guilty Feelings" distinguishes between the genuine moral conscience and the guilty feeling of the neurotic or infantile conscience. The concern of the latter is not whether *x* is right or wrong, but whether *x* enhances or threatens one's acceptance, security, and status, with the group to which one is looking for support and protection. This is still a major factor in determining religious attitudes, even of students in the universities. Paul's challenge to Peter at Antioch is still a live issue. The compulsive emotional need to receive honour one of another remains, as our Lord said it would, an insurmountable barrier to true and courageous belief. The God-given fact of the one Church can never hope to see the light of an earthly day until churchmen are delivered from the domination of this law of psychological slavery.

In a Foreword Dr MacCalman, the Nuffield Professor of Psychiatry in the University of Leeds, refers to the "often pathetic gratitude which listeners expressed to Mr Guntrip for these talks". This is certainly a book to lend to people who are perplexed about themselves. If we would help people in trouble of this nature this is a book to read several times, and also the three central chapters on "The Problem of the Anxious Mind" in Mr Guntrip's earlier book, *Psychology for Ministers and Social Workers.* FRANK LAKE.

EDUCATION IN GREAT BRITAIN. By W. O. Lester Smith. Oxford University Press. 5s.

THE IMPACT OF EDUCATION ON SOCIETY. Joseph Payne Lectures, 1948. By W. O. Lester Smith. Blackwell. 3s. 6d.

The Education Act of 1944 provides a suitable vantage-point from which to survey our educational system in the light of its past history. Professor Lester Smith has admirably performed this task in a volume recently added to the *Home University Library*. To have packed into 200 pages centuries of English educational history (Wales and Scotland get incidental reference) in a form delightful to read is no mean achievement. Accurate scholarship, grace of style, and wise and sane judgment, are conspicuous throughout, and every page affords evidence of the author's wide reading. Here and there a line from the poets serves to enliven the administrative detail.

Particularly fine is Professor Lester Smith's treatment of aims and ideals in the opening chapter. With masterly conciseness he discusses the conflicting claims of the individual and society, the merits of tolerance and discussion, the personal role of the teacher, and the value of a goal by which to measure progress. Next come chapters on "Order and Diversity" and "Religion", sketching the religious schisms and controversies from the Reformation to 1870 which, by engendering *odium theologicum*, delayed the establishment of a national system. The quarrels and rivalries of "Anglicans", Puritans, and Dissenters, and the growth of scientific rationalism, are handled with fairness to all parties. Cromwell and Locke stand out as protagonists of tolerance and compromise.

Chapter IV treats of the curriculum in the light of the historical and social influences which have moulded it. In Chapter V the relations of the State and the School are traced from the nineteenth century to the present day. Chapter VI outlines the present system, with its reorganization of primary and secondary schools, the changes in examinations, and the new provisions for the training of teachers. In conclusion "Education and the Community" discusses plans for further education, including County Colleges and Community Centres, and recreative facilities for school children. There is an excellent bibliography. I have noted a number of minor misprints in the book, and on page 113, line 23, "Liverpool" should read "London".

This volume is an eloquent plea for the preservation of all that is best in our English tradition. Professor Lester Smith sees the Butler

Act as an equitable compromise and a hopeful spring-board for future advances. "Much will turn upon our genius for assimilating the new without destroying what is good in our heritage" (p. 162). The Christian faith is essential as a basis, though some reshaping of religious education is suggested by his quotation on page 129 from Matthew Arnold: "Two things about the Christian religion must surely be clear; one is that men cannot do without it; the other that they cannot do with it as it is."

The same author's Joseph Payne lectures for 1948 provide a fitting companion piece to the larger volume, and present the same democratic philosophy from the standpoint of "The Impact of Education on Society". The three lectures, entitled respectively The Past, The Present, and The Future, discuss the influence which our schools have had since medieval times, are having, and should have, on the life of Society, and stress is again laid on the virtues of tolerance, discussion, and personal relationship. Much wisdom and happy quotation are compressed into fifty pages which show the difficulties of steering a middle course between *laissez-faire* and totalitarian indoctrination. "Real cultural freedom", he quotes from Professor Barbara Wootton, "demands not merely variety but actual indeterminacy of cultural ends." On p. 34 he sets out four current problems which he discusses briefly in the final lecture, but space allows citation only of his concluding remark: "In these unsettled and challenging days our greatest need in education is not a plan or a new dogma but imaginative and adaptable leadership within our schools."

University of Liverpool. Alex. J. D. Porteous.

Islam in Ethiopia. By J. Spencer Trimingham. Oxford University Press. 25s.

Many general readers will be interested in this book, for it describes part of the romantic story of how the little Christian fortress of Abyssinia has survived for centuries as an independent kingdom in the face of Muslim and other pressures. It is the second of Mr Trimingham's special studies on Islam in Africa, the first of which was *Islam in the Sudan*. It is a thorough and efficient study, a work of scholarship rather than the account of one man's observations. After an introductory chapter "The Region and its Folk", a geographical and sociological survey, the author gives a detailed account of the history of Ethiopia, more particularly dealing with the expansion of Islam into the area and the period following the Muslim conquest of the sixteenth century. This is followed by a careful description of the Muslim tribes of the whole area of Ethiopia, which, as a geographical term, includes Abyssinia, the Somalilands, and Eritrea. The book is concluded by a chapter summing up the special characteristics of Islam in the region. The text is supplemented by excellent maps, especially by two large ones of the languages and religions of North-east Africa. The book is the first published complete study of the history and institutions of Islam in Ethiopia, and will long remain the standard reference book.

Although the detailed mention of so many tribes and places becomes a little tedious, especially in the third chapter, this book deserves to be read by many more than those who are personally interested in Ethiopia. It will interest those who are concerned with Islam generally. They will see here how Islam works itself out in one of its outlying regions, and how successfully it interacts with and assimilates much of primitive paganism; especially interesting are the sections dealing with the Dervish Orders and with Saint Worship, and occasional references to the contrast between nomadic and urban Islam. So also are those sections in which Mr Trimingham sums up the factors in the Christianity and Islam of this region which make for strength or weakness.

But this book is more than an account of Islam: it merits attention by all who bear responsibility for religious missionary work. It is concerned indirectly with two important questions of missionary strategy to-day: "What part do social, economic, and political factors play in the advance of a great religion?" and "Are we to-day in danger of over-emphasizing the spiritual and individualistic side of our missionary work, and so of creating a religion which has no real roots in a people's life?" Abyssinia has been a country where down through the centuries there has been a continual ebb and flow of Islam and Christianity, partly at the expense of each other, and, although this book is concerned with the history of particular tribes and regions, on page after page some advance or decline is recorded and a reason given which might obtain in any part of the mission field. Examples are the strength of national feeling, the influence over a long period of a language determining the religion of an area, the effect of intermarriage and of isolation, both of Muslim and Christian groups, the hopes of winning protection either from Christian emperors or Muslim rulers, the effect of the conversion of a chief on his tribe, motives of commerce and the influence of cities on surrounding peoples, the encouragement of Christianity as a unifying force by the emperors of the last century and a half which under Theodore and John went to the length of forcible conversion, and the corresponding encouragement which Fascist Italy gave to Islam. If these "non-religious" factors are as decisive as this book suggests, then discussion of missionary method must range far more widely than is usually the case. One finishes this book with an uneasy feeling that missionary agencies are not the only factors which operate in missionary advance, and with a desire to re-read the book in order to apply its lessons to missionary work in general.

The following printing errors have been noticed: p. 1, for "north-west and west" read "north-east and east"; p. 28, line 22, delete "in"; p. 54, line 2, for "Solomonids" read "Solominids"; p. 77, line 3, for "effort" read "effect"; p. 129 n., for "1941" read "1491"; p. 191, line 27, for "each" read "east."

We look forward with great interest to the succeeding volume on Nigeria.

D. A. Brown.

Juba, Sudan.

MAX JOSEPH METZGER. By Lilian Stevenson. S.P.C.K. 9s. 6d.
EDITH STEIN. By Sister Teresia de Spiritu Sancto, O.D.C. Sheed and Ward. 15s.

Dr Metzger—known in his community of the society of Christ the King as Bruder Paulus—was so nauseated by the horrors of war which he saw during a brief period as a chaplain in 1914 that he resolved to give his life for peace. He made many friends in European countries and had connexions with pacifism, so that for some considerable time before his final arrest he had been an object of the Gestapo's suspicion. The excuse they had long waited for came when a memorandum Metzger had written about the future of Germany was intercepted while on its way to the Lutheran Archbishop of Uppsala; it contained the request that it should be circulated to the bishops of all the belligerent countries. Metzger was in various prisons for almost a year, sometimes in fetters, but he continued to write letters steeped in the New Testament and to compose poems (many of them printed, in German with a translation, in this book) and liturgical music, until he was beheaded in April 1944.

Metzger had attended the Lausanne Conference of 1927 as a Roman Catholic "observer", and this lively interest in the ecumenical movement he maintained to the end. He prayed earnestly for the unity of the Church, which he does not seem to regard as something already given, and in an appeal to the Pope (included here) to initiate conversations with Protestants he begs the Roman authorities to remember that the tragic divisions of Christendom were in part Rome's responsibility. He saw worldliness and legalism in Rome and said so, and was out of patience with some of her theologians; and it is for his utter integrity rather than for the profundity of his thought (cf. "Dogmatic differences are not to-day the main element that hinders reunion", p. 51), which is not comparable with, e.g. Bonhoeffer's, that makes us grateful for this book.

Edith Stein was born into a devout Jewish family in Breslau in 1891, and after a distinguished academic career at Breslau and Göttingen universities she became *Privat-dozent* at Freiburg under the phenomenalist philosopher Edmond Husserl. At this time she was an atheist, but within six years she had been baptized in the Roman Catholic Church and was soon well known as a lecturer at Catholic meetings and learned societies. She remained quite unaffected by her celebrity, and would much have preferred the secluded life of a nun had not her ecclesiastical advisers urged the great importance of her public work. And there was also her family to consider, for she felt that her Jewish mother, already saddened by her conversion, would be heart-broken if she actually went out of "the world" altogether. But the Third Reich made her teaching impossible, and she was granted admission to the Carmelite house at Cologne. She had no illusions about being personally safer in an enclosed order; and when she was transferred to one of the Dutch convents before the war, she regarded it as only a temporary respite. It was no surprise to her when in 1942 the S.S. fetched her from her devotions in the chapel as part of a reprisal for the bishops' pastoral letter (26 July

1942) which protested against German brutalities and deportations of Jews. An agonizing journey at last ended (so far as is known) in the gas-chambers of Auschwitz.

The first part of this biography is a monotonous recital of the impressions made by Dr Stein on her various acquaintances: of her brilliant intellectual gifts accompanied by modesty and simplicity of character. But how wretchedly meagre is the information at the very points where we passionately want to know most! Of the mental processes of her conversion we hear only of the influence of some casual evening lectures she heard, of the bravery of a Christian widow, of the Lord's Prayer which she took with pupils in the Gothic Old High German. We are told that she would probably have embraced Reformed Christianity but for the chance reading of the life of St Teresa. But are we to understand that this alone was the decisive factor in so tremendous a step by so distinguished a savant? By what paths did Husserl's "most discerning pupil" graduate to Thomism? What was her attitude to the philosophies of those whom Husserl influenced, like Heidegger? How did she instruct her Jewish catechumens? She visited Rudolf Allers in 1931, but we are told nothing of their conversations or discussions. She was introduced to the abbey of Beuron by Fr Przywara and approved of the liturgical revival. We are told, however, that she perceived its danger of a one-sided emphasis (and, later, that she herself would, if possible, hear three Masses in succession, for which she knelt erect throughout), but this promising material is soon cut short by the reminiscences of a Maria Schäfer, who noticed that Edith Stein was always the first to appear in church.

The book comes to life in Part II, with its fascinating glimpses into the Cologne Carmel—Edith's "wedding", the discipline of a constantly changing occupation which never allowed her more than two hours at a stretch with her books, and the terrors of Nazism and the air-raids.

WILFRID BROWNING.

CUDDESDON COLLEGE.

SHORTER NOTICES

THE SPIRITUAL ESPOUSALS. By Blessed Jan van Ruysbroek. Translated by Eric Colledge. Faber and Faber. 18s.

This book is one of the series of the Classics on the Contemplative Life, whose general editor is Professor Allison Peers. It is, so far, the most important work to be published in the series. For the first time we have a complete English translation of a great Flemish mystic's finest work. For many English readers the book will prove a new and exciting discovery. There are several satisfactory editions of St Theresa, St John of the Cross, and *The Cloud of Unknowing*, but hitherto the English reader has been forced to suspect that van Ruysbroek was too "mystical" to be intelligible. That he was once

suspected of heresy seems more easily remembered than the fact that the Church has beatified him.

All this is made clear in the translator's excellent Introduction. The theological precision of Ruysbroek's words and the lucidity of his teaching is partly accounted for by the fact that he was aware that he might be accused of Pantheism and Quietism, heresies which he was anxious to combat.

The present reviewer is not competent to assess the accuracy of a translation from fourteenth-century Dutch; but the translator explains his own principles in the Introduction and they are sound. The work itself does not read like a translation, which is high praise. In a short review it is not possible to attempt an analysis of the work itself, which is already done with great skill in the Introduction. Mr Colledge shows how the key to Ruysbroek's thought is that "Nature is the bride of God, and he made her in his own image" (Introduction, p. 17). *The Spiritual Espousals* is a work of great beauty and lucidity and deserves to rank on the shelves with St Theresa, St John of the Cross, and other spiritual classics.

It only remains to say that the book would be enriched by an historical introduction. Though little is known of the writer, more could have been said of his background. We know that Father Baker was familiar with his works, as he was also with the Spiritual Exercises of Michael of Coutances, Carthusian of the sixteenth century. A detailed study of the debt of mystical theology to Carthusian spirituality remains to be written.

TUNBRIDGE WELLS. B. M. OMAN.

THE COMMUNICATION OF THE GOSPEL. By David H. C. Read. S.C.M. Press. 7s. 6d.

The chaplain to the University of Edinburgh, in giving the Warrack lectures, follows in an august line of predecessors. He does wisely to take a line of thought with which he is exceptionally well qualified to deal, the problem of *communication*. It is of little use for the preacher to be the most profound theologian or the most well-meant philanthropist unless he is able to get across his message to a generation for whom, as the writer well says, Genesis is a biological term and Revelation the name of a suitcase. What content has the word "God" or "salvation" or "redemption" to the man in the street to-day (one is tempted to add, "to the man in the *pew*")?

This is an old problem, of course. How is one to make the eternal Gospel relevant to and understood by contemporary man? How translate without vitiating the content of the message? The answer is partly to be found in our doctrine of the Holy Spirit, the Illuminator, the Life-Giver, the Contemporizer. But having said that we have not said all. Ceaseless effort is called for, not only to understand the Gospel, but so to enter into the spirit of the age in which we live as to be able to see at what special points the Word of God impinges on our situation, and to express that relevance in language understood by our hearers.

This is a task calling for dedication, concentration, and courage. Mr Read's book is one of the best I have ever read which deals with this problem.

London College of Divinity. F. D. Coggan.

Religious Dances. By E. Louis Backman. Translated from the Swedish by E. Classen. Allen and Unwin. 35s.

This well illustrated and attractively printed book, by the Professor of Pharmacology at Upsala, is an account of the origins and history of religious dances in the Christian Church, from the earliest times until the present day, and the attitude of the religious authorities towards them. It is concerned particularly with the relation of the religious dance with medicine, and discusses at some length the dance epidemics of the Middle Ages.

D. A. B.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.)

Allen and Unwin: *Religion in the Modern World* (7s. 6d.).

Blackfriars: *Vocation* (Eng. trans. of *Le Discernement des Vocations de Religieuses*) (10s. 6d.).

Blackwell: *The Socratic, Number Five: Contemporary Philosophy and Christian Faith* (4s.).

Carey Kingsgate Press: Arthur Dakin, *Spiritual Healing* (9d.).

East and West Library: J. H. Hertz, *Sayings of the Fathers* (10s. 6d.); Julius Guttman (Ed.), *Maimonides: The Guide of the Perplexed* (21s.).

Gollancz: Nicholas Berdyaev, *The Realm of Spirit and the Realm of Caesar* (15s.).

Independent Press: A. J. B. Higgins, *The Reliability of the Gospels* (3s.).

Longmans: J. V. Langmead Casserley, *The Retreat from Christianity in the Modern World* (12s. 6d.); *The Ancient Christian Writers* (10 vols of translations of patristic works) (25s.each).

Manchester University Press: P. R. Weis, *Mishnah Horayoth: Its History and Exposition* (25s.).

Moscow Patriarchate: *Conference in defence of peace of all Churches and Religious Associations in the U.S.S.R. on 9–12 May, 1952: Documents and Materials* (n.p.).

Mowbray: H. E. W. Turner, *The Patristic Doctrine of Redemption* (12s. 6d.).

Religious Education Press: N. J. Bull, *Jesus and His Teaching* (7s. 6d.).

S.C.M. Press: N. F. S. Ferré, *Return to Christianity* (5s.); Stephen Neill, *Towards Church Union 1937–1952: a survey of approaches to closer union among the Churches* (6s.); G. E. P. Cox, *The Gospel according to Saint Matthew* (9s.); Martin Jarrett-Kerr, C.R., *The Hope of Glory* (8s. 6d.).

Sheed and Ward: Anthony Standen, *Science is a Sacred Cow* (10s. 6d.).

Skeffington: K. E. Kirk, *The Threshold of Ethics* [Fourth impression. The first impression was reviewed in Theology, August 1933. p. 119, by Dr Leonard Hodgson] (8s. 6d.).

World Dominion Press: A. McLeish, *Christ's Hope of the Kingdom* (6s.).

Zwingli-Verlag (Zürich): Theodor Rüsch, *Die Entstehung der Lehre vom Heiligen Geist* (Fr. 11.95).

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher